

March 1, 2010

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER  
CITY OF RENTON**

**Minutes**

OWNER: Kolin B. Taylor  
KBS III, LLC  
12320 NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 100  
Bellevue, WA 98005

APPLICANT/CONTACT: Wayne Potter  
Barghausen Consulting Engineer  
18215 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue S  
Kent, WA 98032

Cavalla Preliminary Plat  
File No.: LUA 08-097, PP, ECF

LOCATION: Southeast of 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE and SE 137<sup>th</sup> Place

SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Requesting an amended Preliminary Plat and SEPA review approval of a 9.40 acre site to be subdivided into 49 lots for single-family residential with Tracts for stormwater and joint use driveways. Hearing was reopened due to insufficient notice of hearing to all interested parties.

SUMMARY OF ACTION: Development Services Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT: No new Report was issued by Staff

PUBLIC HEARING: After reviewing the Development Services Report, examining available information on file with the application, field checking the property and surrounding area; the Examiner conducted a public hearing on the subject as follows:

**MINUTES**

*The following minutes are a summary of the October 13, 2009 and February 9, 2010 hearings.  
The legal record is recorded on CD.*

The hearing was opened on Tuesday, October 13, 2009, at 9:02 a.m. in the Council Chambers on the seventh floor of the Renton City Hall. Parties wishing to testify were affirmed by the Examiner.

The following exhibits remained from the original hearing date and Exhibit 15, 16 and 17 were added:

<b><u>Exhibit No. 1:</u></b> Yellow file containing the original application, proof of posting, proof of publication and other documentation pertinent to this request.	<b><u>Exhibit No. 2:</u></b> Vicinity Map
<b><u>Exhibit No. 3:</u></b> Preliminary Plat Plan	<b><u>Exhibit No. 4:</u></b> Landscape Plan
<b><u>Exhibit No. 5:</u></b> Road Plan	<b><u>Exhibit No. 6:</u></b> Aerial Photograph
<b><u>Exhibit No. 7:</u></b> Tree Inventory	<b><u>Exhibit No. 8:</u></b> Picture of Proposed Trees for storm pond area (7 sheets)
<b><u>Exhibit No. 9:</u></b> Access Agreement between Threadgill, Liberty Gardens and Cavalla.	<b><u>Exhibit No. 10:</u></b> Copy of King County Codes regarding Transfer of Development Rights
<b><u>Exhibit No. 11:</u></b> Two Density Credit Transfer agreements between KBS and Respective Owners	<b><u>Exhibit No. 12:</u></b> Gwendolyn High Testimony
<b><u>Exhibit No. 13:</u></b> Prior Preliminary Plat with 38 Lots	<b><u>Exhibit No. 14:</u></b> New Condition #1
<b><u>Exhibit No. 15:</u></b> Letter with new Conditions presented by Rocale Timmons	<b><u>Exhibit No. 16:</u></b> Memorandum presented by David Halinen
<b><u>Exhibit No. 17:</u></b> Printed copy of Oliphant testimony	

Rocale Timmons stated that this application was submitted to King County DDES in early 2006, since that time the property was annexed into the City of Renton. It is vested to King County's R-4 Development Standards. This plat will also be subject to the City of Renton's procedures. The applicant proposed 49 single family lots on 9.40 acres. There are two existing parcels and one existing single family residence that would be removed. The gross density would be approximately 5.21 dwelling units per acre.

The interior lots would average 4300 square feet and the exterior lots would average 6000 square feet. Proposed access to the site would be via 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE, which abuts the site to the west and then 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE located on the eastern portion of the site. This would be a proposed dedication provided by the applicant, which is an extension of 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE.

The Environmental Review Committee issues a Determination of Non-Significance – Mitigated with two mitigation measures. No appeals were filed.

This project does comply with King County's Comprehensive Plan designation. In King County's R-4 zone, the density allowed is 4 dwelling units per gross acre, this allows a maximum density of up to 6 dwelling units per acre. This excess of the base density is allowed for the use of Transfer of Development Rights, which the applicant is pursuing per Chapter 21a37 of the King County Code. The applicant has proposed 5.21 dwelling units per gross acre, which is an 11 lot increase from the base density that would have been allowed in the zone.

A Transfer of Development Rights allows for the transfer of development rights from another area outside of the urban growth boundary. It is basically the development rights that a potential property could have had to use to develop. Eleven lots that could have been developed somewhere else could be transferred to this development. The applicant has provided a Purchase and Sell Agreement which is the first step. At Preliminary Plat approval, the applicant would be required to provide a Purchase and Sell Agreement. Staff has requested that the first condition be revised, rather than just requesting a Purchase and Sell or the actual Transfer of Development Rights documentation, they would be asking that the applicant perform all steps and complete all documentation necessary as required by King County and the City of Renton in order to process the transfer of Development Rights properly for this subject plat only.

Development standards of King County requires a minimum of a 30-foot lot width, no depth or size are required. The applicant has proposed different lot variations within the site. All lots exceed the 30-foot requirement. King County Code further requires a 10-foot front yard setback for the primary structure and a 20-foot setback for the garage. All side and rear yards require only a 5-foot setback. The applicant, however, has proposed a 15-foot setback for the primary structure on the interior lots. In the right-of-way the applicant has also provided an 8-foot landscape strip in addition to a 5-foot public sidewalk. The lots along the exterior would have a 20-foot setback for the primary structure and 25-foot setback for the garage.

The building standards for the site were stated incorrectly in the Staff Report. It is noted that 55% is the impervious surface coverage in the report, however for the use of TDR, the applicant is able to utilize the R-6 development standards which allows 70% impervious surface coverage for each lot. The building height would be 35-feet for each single family residence.

The proposed landscape plan includes a 10-foot landscape easement parallel to 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE and 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue that would be easements on private property with significant landscaping and a good neighbor fence which would be modulated along 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE. There are at least 20-feet of landscaping along 162<sup>nd</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup> from the back of the curb to the face of the fence, in addition to that the applicant is proposing an 8-foot landscape strip along the perimeter of the interior lots. Within that landscape strip the applicant proposes to use two smaller variety street trees, staff would like to see the applicant replace the variety of smaller street tree with a larger variety of street tree along the interior lots and possibly the smaller street trees could be used on the exterior lots behind the larger variety of tree that has already been proposed.

There are 429 trees located on the site, all are proposed to be removed due to the topography of the site. The applicant has indicated that it would be very challenging to retain any of the trees on site. King County code does allow the removal of all trees as long as they are replaced. The applicant would be required to retain 94 trees, if they are not able to do so. The applicant has proposed to replace 193 trees total, which does meet the requirement for King County tree replacement.

King County code requires that the applicant provide recreation on site. On this site, the applicant is required to provide 390 square feet of recreation space per lot, approximately 38,000 square feet of recreation area has been provided within the proposed detention pond tract. There is a walking trail that surrounds the pond, which will include benches, tables and umbrellas as well as passive recreation for small children. The applicant should also provide a public benefit on the pathway due to the needs of the school children in the area. The pathway should be dedicated as a public easement. There would also be a fence on the interior of the trail that surrounds the pond for safety.

Half street improvements have been proposed along 162<sup>nd</sup> Ave SE as well as dedication of a 35.5 foot right-of-way width along the eastern portion of the site for the extension of 164<sup>th</sup> Ave SE. In the northeast portion of the site a turnaround has been provided, a portion of which is located on the Issaquah School District property. An agreement is in place until such time as the road would be extended to the north. The internal road system connects 162<sup>nd</sup> Ave SE to 164<sup>th</sup> Ave SE which satisfied the secondary access requirements. Further there is an alley that has been proposed for the interior Lots 31-49.

A Transportation Mitigation Fee would be imposed on this project and a School Mitigation Fee payable to the Issaquah School District would be imposed as well.

The ERC issued a mitigation measure requiring the applicant to comply with the 2005 Surface Water Design Manual, which will accommodate some of the concerns in this area.

A Homeowner's Association should be created to maintain all common improvements on site.

The applicant further should maintain all landscaping and all amenities provided within Tract A from the fence outward and the City of Renton would be responsible for the storm pond located from the fence inward.

Water service to the site is being provided by Water District 90, the applicant would be required to provide approved plans from Water District 90 prior to engineering permit approval. The applicant has received a Certificate of Water Availability. The applicant would further be required to provide an 8" line for sewer within 162<sup>nd</sup> Ave SE and extend to all lots as required.

Wayne Potter, Barghausen Consultants, 18215 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave S, Kent 98032 stated the project team was with him that included the landscape architect and engineers who were at the hearing to answer any questions.

This project has a long history through King County, pre-application meetings, site visits and working with various members of King County and the City of Renton. This project was started in 2005 and they are excited about the project being presented today. The developer has thoughtfully gone through every detail to come up with a project that would lessen impacts with respect to the additional 11 lots of the TDRs.

In general they are satisfied with the conditions placed on this project by Staff; however, there are a few things that he wanted to bring to the attention of the Examiner and possibly give some clarifications. Regarding the setbacks, it appears that the City is considering in the future allowing flexibility with respect to front yard porches that would potentially encroach on typical front yard setbacks. This is what they have tried to do with this project, varying elevations, modulations with buildings making sure there is not just a row of houses with the exact same setbacks. It appears that the City is considering allowing decks/porches to encroach the setbacks to provide another esthetic element to the streetscape. If this project is approved today and if this ordinance should be approved that it would become applicable to this project.

The Examiner stated that he could not guarantee that, they are present today under existing code and existing code has certain provisions. Whether you can modify the plat after the fact would have to be explored with Staff. The main question or problem would be the precedence it creates. Everyone could come in and say they wanted their plat to abide by these standards, but if the standards are relaxed in the future then they want those standards to apply. The standards could vary from week to week or month to month. That flexibility could cause many problems.

This plat has the advantage of the King County Code and now you are looking to take advantage of the current plus potential changes in the Renton code.

The lots could achieve a variety of looks with the use of landscaping, mixing larger and smaller trees and creating a designer look.

Mr. Potter continued with a minor correction on page 10 of the Staff Report, under Surface Water, second paragraph it indicates that there is a proposed storm water vault located in Tract A. It is a pond and not a vault.

Also with respect to the revisions to Condition 1, with regards to TDR's, Mr. Halinen would address that matter later. There would be no problem in adding the language to the condition that they would meet the King County requirements for TDR's outlined in their code.

The Examiner also noted a correction to the Staff Report on page 4 of 12, the consistency with Short Plat criteria is mentioned twice and it is obviously Preliminary Plat and not Short Plat.

Mr. Potter continued regarding some items that were discussed and provided some clarification. They have met with CARE and gone through this project, made revisions based on comments received from them that appeared to be applicable. They also met with adjacent property owners to the south, they met with the developer of Liberty Gardens to discuss projects and try to work together for a good product in this area.

Many of the improvements made in the project not only meet but exceed King County requirements as well as requirement of the City of Renton. They have varied the lot widths with good depths and variations in setbacks. There are also additional landscaping opportunities, there would be a separation from the back of the curb to the sidewalk for safety reasons as well as additional landscaping. With regards to providing more landscaping for the alley load lots, on the front of these lots (31-40) because of the grade separation, they have put a wall back from the sidewalk and added additional landscaping so the wall is not right up to the back of the sidewalk.

They have exceeded the requirements for King County for open space and recreation. The storm pond design includes passive recreation and active recreation and put them together to create a space where the open pond would be a feature to be enjoyed by not only the people within the plat but also the community. With that, they have increased the landscaping, have proposed to move trees and create meandering sidewalks along 162<sup>nd</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup> trying to take advantage of the 20' landscaping on both of those main streets and providing fencing with trellis design. The landscaping plan is very detailed and construction ready. They have worked diligently with Liberty High school to make the best use of the turnaround. There would be a modulated fence along 164<sup>th</sup> that will break up the look of a long straight fence that is seen in most developments. Every other lot will have the fence modulated and enhanced with landscaping and the other lot with a trellis to try to lessen the impact of a straight wall.

Regarding the trees, they have looked at the landscape to see if there were pockets of trees that they could try to save to incorporate in this plat. There is a challenge when it comes to design, the size of these lots and 30' of elevation drop from the northeast corner to the southwest corner. In doing so, they have elected to increase the landscape on the project to exceed the replacement tree requirements of King County to try to lessen that impact. They are working with native trees and they feel confident that they have accomplished that goal.

There has been some discussion about an agreement with three developers, at the very beginning of this project when the plan was submitted to King County, a letter was sent to all three projects, Threadgill, Liberty Gardens and Cavalla. Threadgill received preliminary plat approval through King County prior to annexation. Liberty Gardens had received SEPA determination and was within weeks of having a hearing before the King County Hearing Examiner prior to the annexation. King County met with all three developers to come up with a solution to secondary access. Their concern was in and out of this area. The three developers agreed as a whole they needed to come up with a solution. In the end, prior to annexation, 162<sup>nd</sup> was the preferred access going directly south in front of Cavalla and Liberty Gardens. Through meetings with the City and going through designs and because of the impacts to several sensitive areas, it was determined that the less impact and the preferred alternative for extension and secondary access would be 164<sup>th</sup> and that is why revisions were made. The agreement leaves room for an alternative access, 167<sup>th</sup> Ave SE, and if that were determined to be better, all three parties have agreed to follow that recommendation.

David Halinen, Attorney for applicant provided a copy of a portion of the King County code that deals with Transfer of Development Rights, Chapter 21a.37. He further provided copies of two Density Credit Transfer Agreements; one involving the purchase of nine such credits and the other the purchase of two credits for the total of eleven that are being contemplated in this plat.

Gwendolyn High, 155 Yakima Avenue, Renton 98059 appeared on behalf of CARE stated that they were her neither in support or opposition of this project. This will happen and they would like to present some clarifications for review.

They are pleased with the current project proposal. They presented a list of conditions that have been offered by the applicant they are requesting that they be specific conditions of approval including lot variation, setbacks, landscaping, street plan and access to the pond.

The main matter is the TDR, this community is sensitized against TDRs due to the poor implementation to date and the negative impacts that the residents have suffered as a result. With this project the community will have absorbed about 20% of all TDRs transferred in King County since the first TDR was sold in 1999. Until now there has been no provision of infrastructure or amenity improvements to appropriately accommodate and mitigate the increased negative impacts. Many discussions have taken place and many neighbors still believe that TDRs must be opposed as a matter or principal regardless of the specific proposal. The community has more to gain from Cavalla being built as currently proposed than would be lost if the project were to be built to the lower King County density standards. The community would not challenge the use of TDRs at this time due to the amenities that the development proposes.

They would like to request the following conditions; signs to be placed at the access points of the walk around the storm pond so that the public knows they are welcome, opening hours and rules of behavior should be included in that signage. It appears that half street improvements for 162<sup>nd</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup> are inadequate, half streets are only adequate for service of 35 dwellings or fewer, this plat is proposed at 39 and Liberty Gardens has been approved at 36 for a total of 85 units. It appears that full street improvements for 162<sup>nd</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup> would be required. There appears to be no conceptual drainage plan for this development, King County requires a curb on one side for drainage and therefore, the City's stormwater and traffic division review the proposed plat and make sure the alley design meets the intent and purpose of both road standards and drainage standards. CARE hopes that the implementation of this project will be a powerful and effective example of the proper use of TDRs. The transfer process must be complete and correct. It was requested that Staff Condition 1 in the written

report to the Hearing Examiner be modified to require conformance with all necessary applicable portions of King County Code, specifically 21a.37.080, 21a.37.130 and 21a.37.140. It is important that what is offered actually happens.

Dave Petrie, 811 S 73<sup>rd</sup> Court, Des Moines 98198 requested that the Hearing Examiner recommend to the Renton City Council that the Cavalla plat be revised and returned to the 38 lot configuration that was submitted under King County in January 2006. It would then be fully compliant with the R-4 Renton Comprehensive Plan. The increase in density would damage his property because of the lower cost and smaller lots, the greater reason was the effect on the neighborhood. Mr. Petrie read a statement regarding his involvement with the TDR matter. He is a developer and was invited to a meeting with the planning commission regarding the use of TDRs, he was the only developer that showed up for the meeting. He further related events that took place with the Evendale development. It appeared that the planning commission was against TDRs and he fully supported them.

The Examiner asked for an explanation of the impacts and why he believed this project was inappropriate.

Mr. Petrie continued stating that he liked the landscaping however, the density is an issue, he wanted to see the development go back to the original 38 lots and still have all the amenities. Originally Renton wanted 164<sup>th</sup> as the major arterial, 162<sup>nd</sup> is the better route, but that had impacts on the environment. He proposed an underground vault and was criticized for that suggestion.

Debi Eberle, 18225 SE 147<sup>th</sup> Street, Renton 98059 stated that she is the vice president of CARE and a Watershed Steward. She reported that the yellow flag iris is on the noxious weed list and should not be used in the landscape in this development. Native plants should be used whenever possible. The system needs trees that feed bugs and keep fish alive. The open space, wetland area and detention pond are good for the environment and they need to be kept open to the public. TDRs require a delicate balance and there needs to be a balance and it needs to work correctly.

Doris Yopez, 16444 SE 135<sup>th</sup> Street, Renton 98059 stated that she lives near the development and she was concerned about the tree retention. There are two cedars that are 34" in diameter, they are older forest trees. There are also some Hemlocks that are very large as well located in the northwest corner. She does not want to see clear cutting it causes erosion when land is cleared this way. This would have the potential to pollute the Cedar River. She was not in favor of TDRs and would like to see the plat go back to the original 38 lots.

In the planting area that also is some bamboo and holly, she is not sure of the type of bamboo intended to be planted, the non-invasive type would be alright, but the invasive type spreads and is more difficult to get out than blackberries. They need to keep native plants in the pond area.

Gary Norris, Transportation Engineer, PO Box 547, Preston stated that at the time previous traffic counts were conducted there was a lot of construction activity in the area and the construction activity was generating a lot more traffic that was anticipated from the single family developments. As the construction has calmed down, the traffic volumes have receded and the economic impact has had an impact on traffic as well.

The intersections in the area can handle the additional lots of this particular project.

Kayren Kittrick, Community and Economic Development stated that the sewer on 162<sup>nd</sup> is open to be on either 164<sup>th</sup> or 162<sup>nd</sup> it is gravity and engineering will determine which way it will go. The temporary turnaround is needed because of the distance, it may or may not go away the Issaquah School District has the available frontage that they could develop the whole road, they could do their half. They have been exploring the possibility of extra parking for the ball field. The easement should not be finalized until just before the final plat because it needs to match what is actually built.

The Examiner stated that a condition was needed to state that the temporary turnaround is being constructed with this project.

Kayren Kittrick continued stating that the ERC stated the use of the 2005 Manual for the drainage issues. They cannot divert any water, all water coming onto the site must be accommodated, the 2005 Manual will go a long way in resolving some of the issues or at least will not make them worse. Most of the drainage issues are on the southerly side of the property because there is a stream in that vicinity, there is some flooding on 160<sup>th</sup> as well some backing across property lines in the vicinity. It is well documented where the problems are and that will be watched very closely.

To the east and south is a Park's Department property, King County Parks will be handing that property over to the City of Renton. The City Park's Department will be going through its usual outreach process to develop the area. To clarify, both 164<sup>th</sup> and 162<sup>nd</sup> are not designated as arterials, at most they are residential collectors by their character, there is no direct access off of them very often, they are access through the residential properties. As such a half street improvement is allowed, this is actually more than a half street, it is 22 feet of pavement in their frontages and all points of connection must be a minimum of 20 feet.

A 10 minute recess was taken... returned to the record at 10:53 am

Wayne Potter stated that he was going to try to bring some clarity to some of the outstanding issues. With respect to the e-mail provided by Gwendolyn with recommendations he stated they have no problems if Staff wants to include the improvements that are part of the TDRs as conditions with the caveat that if the TDRs are not approved, those particular improvements would not be applicable.

The Examiner questioned if the TDRs were discretionary at this time or if the agreement is executed is it a fait accompli.

Mr. Halinen stated that it is a fait accompli.

Mr. Potter continued that they agreed that there would be public access to the path amenities. The half street issues were addressed by Ms. Kittrick, however, on Sheet 5 there is a cross section of 162<sup>nd</sup> Ave, King County requested that 30-feet of asphalt be provided from face of curb to the asphalt.

There are many ways to design the alley, they are open to the standard King County requirement.

The onsite and off-site drainage issues have been analyzed extensively. A Level 1 drainage analysis that was prepared and submitted was reviewed by King County at the time, they requested a Level 3 analysis. Ed McCarthy was hired to prepare that analysis, in the end they agreed to provide Level 3 drainage control and sized the pond accordingly.

The temporary turnaround, the intent is to provide a temporary easement that would stay on the adjacent property, or the option of splitting the easement on both sides of the right-of-way or providing the easement on the entire project of Cavalla. There are options, Issaquah School District has many design options and they would be willing to work with Staff to ultimately come up with the best solution. The preference would be to flip the temporary turnaround onto the School property, in initial conversations with them, they were okay with that.

They would be willing to work with CARE to provide native plants in the landscaping. They would also look at the large cedars and Hemlocks, they will look at options again. Cedar trees are very sensitive and when removing other trees around them it could be problematic.

Ms. Timmons read her new Condition 1 to the Staff Report:

“The applicant shall perform all steps and complete all documentation necessary as required by King County Code Section 21A.37 and the City of Renton in order to process the transfer of development rights properly for this subject plat only the certificate or other valid legal document(s) must show the applicant or successor as the lawful owner of the development rights. Alternatively, the plat design shall be reconfigured to reflect the density allowable under the R-4 Zone without the TDR bonus.”

The Examiner stated that there is no plat without the TDRs. Reverting back to a 38-lot plat leaves some concerns and questions.

David Halinen stated that he had reviewed the new Condition 1 with his client and it is acceptable as drafted. Regarding the point that without the TDRs there is no plat and this would revert back to a 38-lot plat, the last sentence could be slightly modified to provide some sort of remand for further processing if in fact, the TDR approach is not ultimately utilized.

Gwendolyn High mentioned three subsections of KC 21A.37 the last two were .130 and .140 which deal with TDRs are acquired from the County's bank. These TDRs are being acquired from specific property owners not from the Bank. Mr. Halinen read from subsection b of KC 21 regarding TDR development rights.

Ms. Timmons stated that the front yard porches that were proposed by the applicant to encroach into the front yard setback would be approved by Staff as long as it does not encroach into the required setback of 10 feet for the front yards and then because of the front yards that front on the street, they are asking that the front porches do not exceed more than a 15 foot front yard setback.

A detailed landscape plan has not been approved and that a final landscape plan will have to be approved prior to the recording of the plat. They will look specifically at noxious plants as well as the overall landscape plan.

It is obvious that the City has not implemented a TDR program and that it is a very controversial topic. The project is vested to King County R-4 standards, it does have a base density of 4 du/ac and does allow the density to go up to 6 du/ac. The applicant is only proposing 5.21du/ac. It is understood that there are several concerns, they are allowed to exceed the base density of the zone.

Doris Yepez stated that Mr. Potter said that leaving some single Cedars would make them susceptible to the wind, but she would like them to look at the cluster of Cedars on the southeast corner, if those could be retained it would be good.

The **Examiner** called for further testimony regarding this project. There was no one else wishing to speak, and no further comments from staff. The hearing closed at 11:16 a.m.

---

*The following minutes are a summary of the February 9, 2010 hearing.  
The legal record is recorded on CD.*

The hearing was re-opened on Tuesday, February 9, 2010, at 9:01 a.m. in the Council Chambers on the seventh floor of the Renton City Hall. Parties wishing to testify were affirmed by the Examiner.

Rocale Timmons stated that the site is located in northeast Renton, just north of SE 144<sup>th</sup> Street between unimproved 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE and 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE. The site is 9.4 acres and includes an existing single-family residence that would be removed. The proposal is for 49 single family lots with a density of 5.21 dwelling units per acre. Lot sizes range from 4,300 square feet to 6,000 square feet and access to the site would be via 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE and 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE with an internal road system that connects those two external streets. There would also be an alleyway that separates the interior tier of lots (Lots 31-49).

There are 429 trees on the lot, all of which have been marked to be removed. By way of Transfer of Development Rights through the use of vesting to King County Code, the applicant is proposing an additional 11 lots. An explanation of how Transfer of Development Rights may be used.

The Staff did recommend the approval of the proposed plat with 11 conditions; however, since that time Staff did learn of improper notice and additional comments were requested by all property owners within 300 feet of the proposed project. Staff has met with several of the interested parties. Concerns raised by property owners to the north were not addressed at the original hearing. Therefore, Staff has submitted a letter with an additional finding and two additional conditions related to buffering of the site to the north as well as findings related to the TDR.

Currently there is a single family development to the north, with the removal of the trees on site there could be impacts to the residents to the north, therefore Staff is recommending additional fencing and vegetation along the northern property line.

The increase in lots and density was also of concern to the existing residents. Staff does recognize this concern, however, the use of Transfer of Development Rights can only be accomplished as a result of the project being vested in King County and if the preliminary plat approval had not been completed. The use of TDR's cannot be used by other projects that are not in a comparable situation in order to justify the increase in density.

The Examiner asked to have an explanation as to how the project was designed, the lots around the perimeter were designed as larger lots to be more similar to the existing developments and the interior parcels that are buffered by the perimeter lots, and they would be smaller lots with an alley access.

Ms. Timmons stated that the proposal had exceeded several development standards required by King County Code, specifically all of the larger lots are located on the exterior of the site in order to provide a better transition to the surrounding neighborhood. The interior lots are smaller in size, with an average lot size of 4,300 square feet. In addition the applicant has proposed an enhanced layout and circulation system which includes a connection from 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE to 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE as well as an alleyway for the interior lots. This helps the pedestrian circulation. In addition, the applicant has proposed enhanced landscaping along 162<sup>nd</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup> in an approximate 20' width.

The applicant has proposed a very interesting detention area which includes several elements, landscaping, pedestrian amenities, soft gravel pedestrian pathway and all existing vegetation would be relocated to the pond area or to the 164<sup>th</sup> entrance as a decorative feature.

The Examiner stated that under King County Standards, the applicant is entitled to use the TDR. There is no judgment of whether it is a good idea or not, whether the parcels that are transferring the development rights, which are probably more rural to protect farm land or other critical features, it is just that the applicant is entitled to do it as long as they appropriately purchase the rights or negotiate for those rights with another property owner. That other property would then be protected from increased density and this project would take additional density.

Ms. Timmons clarified that the applicant did apply in 2006 prior to annexation which happened in 2008, that is why the applicant is vested to King County Code, which does allow the use of Transfer of Development Rights.

David Halinen, 1019 Regents Blvd, Ste. 202, Fircrest, WA 98466 stated that he and the applicant have had a chance to review the various letters submitted as part of the Reconsideration including letters from Mr. Petrie and the Oliphants. Where the arguments in those letters go wrong is presuming a state of affairs contrary to Washington's vested rights doctrine. The Examiner has ruled that the project is vested.

A three-page memorandum was submitted as Exhibit 16.

It appears that the concerns of the neighbors would include having the site's zoning considerations reopened by the Examiner or the City Council and have the City of Renton's zoning apply. That is not the way Washington law works. The County rules apply and the TDR program applies and so the arguments of the neighbors cannot be considered by the Examiner or the City Council.

The applicant does accept the new conditions noted today.

The Examiner explained the concept of vesting. In this instance, there are two jurisdictions involved, the City of Renton and King County. This property was located in King County before annexation. The applicant came in under King County rules and applied for the project in 2006. They started the process while under King County rules, during that course, this property was annexed into the City of Renton. Under State law which the Courts of Washington have defined, the property is vested under King County Rules. They are entitled to develop under King County rules. As long as the plat appears to serve the public use and interest, it provides roads, sidewalks, stormwater detention and it looks like an appropriate project for the area.

This project is entitled to the Transfer Development Rights and that cannot be changed.

Wayne Potter, Barghausen Consulting Engineer, 17525 120<sup>th</sup> Ave SE, Kent, WA 98032 stated that at the last hearing the project was discussed in great detail. Staff did indicate that they have increased the design standards and the creativity of this project in an effort to help soften the fact that the project is being increased by 11 lots due to the TDR. The applicant wants to make sure that they try to meet, where they can, the City of Renton requirements like rolled curb versus vertical curb and other things like that.

They have agreed to the planting of more trees along the northern property line. King County does allow the removal of trees through their grading and clearing permit. There is a replacement ratio that is required. The landscape plan shows those ratios and how they have met and exceeded those requirements.

Wendy Goodman, 16227 SE 137<sup>th</sup> Place, Renton 98059 stated that she appreciated the additional buffering along the northern boundary and the fact that the fence would be erected prior to construction. She was concerned about the Liberty High School ball field and access to that. There seems to be a huge impact with parking especially during the baseball season. She believed that a new parking lot for the high school ball fields was somewhere in the plans.

Ms. Timmons stated that this issue was discussed in the original hearing, the applicant has proposed both pedestrian and vehicular access to the ball fields. On the eastern portion of the site there is a roadway, SE 164<sup>th</sup> Street with a cul-de-sac at the northeast corner that would provide vehicular access to the ball field as well as parking. There is also pedestrian access that is provided from 162<sup>nd</sup> over to 164<sup>th</sup> as well as all the way up the eastern property line.

Anita Oliphant, 16519 SE 145<sup>th</sup> Street, Renton 98059 stated that she was disappointed with the City of Renton's Planning and Development Department. It appears that someone is trying to pull a fast one on those who live on the east plateau. It is disappointing learning that they only have to notify people within 300 feet of a development of any changes, especially when there are plans to change the R-4 zoning to a higher density using TDR credits. She further felt that this area did not need to be using TDR credits. Renton City Council adopted an R-4 zoning for the entire plateau. Changing that zoning should require applying to City Council in order to make a change and every resident in the PAA must be notified.

Cavalla knew three years ago when they applied for this development that this was an R-4 zone, now they come back with a revised plat using TDR credit. Their first design was unacceptable. This needs to be presented to the City Council of Renton before any considered usage of TDR's is acknowledged and every resident on the plateau must be notified of any City Council meeting, including to change the R-4 zone.

The entire statement read by Mrs. Oliphant was submitted and entered as Exhibit 16.

David Petrie, 811 S 273<sup>rd</sup> Court, Des Moines, WA 98198 thanked the Examiner for stating why it is very hard to make a decision and much research goes into the process.

The Examiner stated that there is a code that allows certain things, people do not always like what it allows. Opinions may be expressed, but within parameters of what is compatible and appropriate within the zone. The City is bound by the applicants submission of this application prior to annexation. They applied for a plat and certain rights under King County law in 2006 and they are entitled to use those rules at this public hearing and before the City Council.

The Examiner asked that Mr. Petrie address the impact of the 11 additional lots, the impact of additional traffic on the neighborhood, and the impact of more people in the neighborhood.

Mr. Petrie continued stating that he has been working on Liberty Gardens for 10 years and he has had three engineers and two wetlands people. There are some things that have happened that this group does not know about and they relate to this issue. There is a common problem in that 162<sup>nd</sup> versus 164<sup>th</sup>, much money was spent working on this problem. Because of one resident on 162<sup>nd</sup> did not want to see the road come through, she was able to turn the whole thing around. No one would be here today if that had not have happened.

The Examiner asked for an explanation as to how this would impact the Cavalla plat, there is a detention pond that meets code, they have appropriate access. Please explain what the problem is with the Cavalla plat. Does it increase stormwater on adjacent property? Are there not adequate roads east and west or north and south providing access to this property? Are the sidewalks complying with the code? Is the density with the permitted TDR under the vested rules allow this plat?

Mr. Petrie stated that he had evidence that a court would certainly want to hear. He does not have the same rights because he has already been heard in Renton. He has talked to the land use people and he has the same rights, both of these plats came in under R-4 because Renton wanted it that way. It was a bartering for the trees and a huge increase in profits. He has a right to have that benefit as well.

The Examiner stated that Mr. Petrie may exercise his rights in his own forum, but right now he would like Mr. Petrie to state what is right or what needs to be changed with this plat. The Liberty Gardens plat is not up for reconsideration at this hearing. If Mr. Petrie would like to resubmit the Liberty Gardens plat, he may do so.

Mr. Petrie stated that they came in on the same basis that he did, he was vested 14 months prior to Cavalla. He should have the same rights to TDR's as they do.

The Examiner stated that Mr. Petrie had every right to do whatever he wants to do. He can make an appointment with Staff, they will consider his application.

The Examiner further stated that he had no authority to look at Mr. Petrie's plat. The Council approved his plat. Liberty Gardens is not the subject of this hearing today.

Mr. Petrie recommended a sweeping review of both plats.

Mrs. Oliphant stated that under the King County Comprehensive Use Plan from 2004, King County stated that any PAA areas inside Renton City limits or going to be, were to be developed under that City's standards and laws.

Wayne Potter stated that this project is designed at 5.21 dwelling units per acre, the actual TDR would allow this to go up to the R-6 zone, but they have not. That would allow a total density of approximately 56 lots. They have elected to increase by only 11 lots.

Regarding the testimony by Mrs. Oliphant regarding an unsightly development, there has been a lot of hard work and effort put into designing a first storm pond that is interactive from the standpoint of providing

stormwater quality treatment, detention along with passive and active recreation, access through the pond. This was to try to help offset some of the impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Chip Vincent, Planning Director, Community and Economic Development Department stated they were trying to create a higher quality development for the community, looking at what has been presented today versus what the project was vested for with fewer units in King County, this is a far superior design. There is both automobile as well as pedestrian connectivity between 162<sup>nd</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup>. The project provides for trees and a canopy cover for the residential community. The stormwater facility is not like any others seen in the neighborhood or the community. This will be an asset for the community. What guided the Department was the increase in quality and the character of the communities that are being created for the City of Renton.

Rocale Timmons stated that if all the conditions that have been recommended by the Hearing Examiner and the additional conditions entered today are complied with Staff moves that the applicant has proposed a project that not only complies with the existing King County Development Standards but exceeds those and should therefore be approved.

The **Examiner** called for further testimony regarding this project. There was no one else wishing to speak, and no further comments from staff. The hearing closed at 10:05 a.m.

#### **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION FOR RE-OPENED HEARING**

Having reviewed the record in this matter, the Examiner now makes and enters the following:

#### **FINDINGS:**

1. The applicant, Kolin B. Taylor, filed a request for a Preliminary Plat. The plat utilizing Transfer of Development Rights (see below) would contain 49 single family detached lots.
2. After issuing a Recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed plat subject to a series of conditions, it was discovered that nearby property owners entitled to notice of the public hearing on the project were not properly notified. At first, these persons were given an opportunity to request reconsideration but it became clear that this would result in a complicated or incomplete set of reconsideration requests and responses. Therefore, to address any submissions in unified manner the public hearing was reopened for public testimony. This would allow all parties to hear the testimony regarding the project and any responses to that testimony in an open forum.
3. At the re-opened hearing, staff reviewed the proposal. They suggested some changes to their original recommendations and those recommended by the Hearing Examiner to the City Council. These changes were based on conversations staff had with neighbors as well as the written submissions of concerned parties. The changes suggested were to create additional buffering along the north edge of the proposed plat with additional landscaping and fencing. The applicant agreed to those changes.
4. It is obvious that the City has not implemented a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program and that its use in this area is very controversial. The application for this plat was submitted while the property was still under the land use jurisdiction of King County that is prior to annexation to the City of Renton. Under development rules required by the Washington Court system the applicant is entitled

to develop the property under the rules and regulations in effect when the application was submitted - namely, under the rules of King County. Those rules permit the use of TDR's. TDR's permit a rural landowner to sell the rights to develop land in rural areas at an increased density to more urban areas. The transfer in effect allows the rural area to retain its rural character with less dense development while increasing the density in a more urban area where roads or sewer systems or other infrastructure are available to support the greater density.

5. In this case the transferred development rights being used would allow eleven (11) additional single family homes to be developed on the subject site.
6. Staff's analysis of the additional submissions suggested that the following two conditions be added to the original conditions:

The applicant shall be required to erect a 6-foot high wood-fence along the northern property line for the length of the property. The fence shall be constructed prior to the Final Plat recording.

The applicant shall be required to plant conifer trees along the northern property line at appropriate spacing based on the vegetation proposed. All trees shall have a minimum height of 8-10 feet. The trees shall be depicted on the detailed landscape plan required to be submitted to and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to Final Plan approval.

7. Staff's analysis further found that the additional submissions or conversations on the TDR were not substantially different than the original issues and suggested no additional changes to its recommendations. Staff emphasized that it believed that the plat as proposed with the additional lots was a superior design when compared to the plat that would not have allowed the increased density. There is additional open space open to residents of the plat and the general public, additional perimeter landscaping, new access routes for traffic and a design that melds the exterior lot sizes to surrounding uses while enveloping the additional density manifested in smaller lots in the interior of the plat.
8. The following findings generally are the same or similar to those found in the original report.
9. The yellow file containing the staff report, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) documentation and other pertinent materials was entered into the record as Exhibit #1.
10. The Environmental Review Committee (ERC), the City's responsible official issued a Determination of Significance - Mitigated (DNS-M).
11. The subject proposal was reviewed by all departments with an interest in the matter.
12. The subject site is located south of SE 137th Place and east of 162nd Avenue SE and west of 164th Avenue SE.
13. The map element of the Comprehensive Plan designates the area in which the subject site is located as suitable for the development of lower density detached single family uses, but does not mandate such

development without consideration of other policies of the Plan.

14. The subject site is currently zoned R-4 (Single Family - 4 dwelling units/acre). The subject site is vested under King County's zoning which is generally equivalent to Renton's designation but the standards for lot area, yard setbacks or dimensions and development standards would be judged against King County standards in effect when the application was submitted. As discussed below, the density may be altered by the Transfer of Development Rights.
15. The subject site was annexed to the City with the adoption of Ordinance 5398 enacted on August 11, 2008.
16. The subject site is approximately 9.4 acres. The site consists of two adjacent lots that abut in a north-south direction. The subject site is approximately 596 feet wide (east to west) by 656 feet deep.
17. The subject site slopes downward toward the southwest. The slopes range from approximately 2.5 percent to 12 percent and average about 10 percent. The northeast corner of the site is approximately 50 feet higher than the southwest corner. Grade and fill will be used to create level building pads and roadways.
18. The site contains 429 significant trees. The applicant proposes removing most, if not all of the trees to accommodate the grading that will occur. (see below for proposed new landscaping.)
19. In developing the subject site the applicant proposes using King County provisions that allow the Transfer of Development Rights. Those provisions allow trading or purchasing development rights attached to certain rural land and use of them in less rural or suburban or urban settings. Those rights, once transferred, reduce the potential density of the rural parcels and boost the permitted density of the receiving property. The R-4 Zone has a base density of 4 dwelling units per acre and the maximum is 6. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) permits the maximum density of 6 units per acre. The number of lots permitted is attained by multiplying the acres, 9.4, by base density of 4, yielding a total of 37.6, or 38 lots. The applicant has proposed a TDR of 11 lots for a total of 49 lots. This creates a density of 5.21 which is less than the maximum density of 6 units per acre.
20. Staff noted that there are no qualitative criteria to allow TDR operation. If the transfer contract is finalized appropriately, then the transfer may take effect. Staff reports that the community around the project expressed opposition to increasing the density on this parcel and the applicant agreed to mitigate some of the potential impacts of increased density by exceeding the minimum standards of the King County Code. The applicant proposed increasing landscaping and passive recreational opportunities, and enhanced plat design and street design. The proposal will include an enhanced detention pond area with pathways open to the general public.
21. As noted, the applicant proposes creating a 49-lot plat with one large detention tract, Tract A. Proposed Lots 1 to 10 will run along the north boundary of the subject site. Proposed Lots 11 to 17 will run along the eastern boundary of the subject site. Proposed Lots 18 to 22 and Tract A would lie along the southern boundary of the site. There would be three tiers of lots in the center of the site aligned east to west. Two tiers, Lots 31 to 40 as the southern tier and 41 to 49 as the northern tier, forming a block in north central portion of the subject site. The third tier generally located north of the detention Tract A

would contain Lots 23 to 30.

22. King County Code has no minimum lot size or depth requirements but does require a minimum 30 foot lot width. The code requires a 10 foot setback for the primary structure and 20 feet for attached garages or parking areas. Other than the front yard setback, all other yards, including rear yards are required to be a minimum of 5 feet. The lots would range in size from approximately 4,040 square feet to 7,803 square feet. The plat has been designed with larger lots along the perimeter of the site to more or less mirror the larger lots normally found in the R-4 Zone. Smaller lots would be located on the interior of the plat in the new block created by the two tiers of lots with alley. The applicant proposes enlarging yards to 20 feet for the homes and 25 feet for the garages for the perimeter lots and 15 feet for the interior alley-loaded lots as an offset to the greater density. The applicant also proposed larger rear yards for the interior parcels. Building height is limited to 35 feet.
23. Staff made the following recommendations to provide a more consistent streetscape:

"that the plat plan be revised to depict the following: one-half of the interior lots (Lots 31-49) provide a 10-foot front yard setback in addition to the sidewalk and landscaping provided in the right-of way and the other one-half of the interior lots provide a 15-foot front yard setback. Additionally, one-half of the exterior lots (Lots 1-30) provide a 20-foot front yard setback for the primary structure and the other one-half of the exterior lots provide a 25-foot front yard setback for the primary structure. Garages are to be setback an additional 5 feet for all front/street loaded lots. "

Staff suggested that the applicant provide at least 8 foot rear yards to accommodate backout room but that the larger rear yards proposed by the applicant were unnecessary. There are no code limitations on larger yards.
24. Access to the subject site would be via 162nd Avenue along the west and 164th Avenue along the east. Both of those streets will be improved with half-street improvements and conveyed to the public with dedications. Both streets are considered residential collectors and are not subject to arterial street standards. Two west to east roads would enter the plat from 162nd Avenue and intersect with a new north to south road that swings east to 164th. An alley would run west to east in the middle of the new block to the rear of Proposed Lots 31 to 49. 164th Avenue would end in a turnaround at its northern terminus. The proposed turnaround would be located on 3rd party property owned by Liberty High School - Issaquah School District. A tentative agreement has been negotiated since the improved street and turnaround would accommodate traffic at the school. If the agreement were not executed, the turnaround would have to be accommodated on the subject site. Staff recommended that no access be allowed directly to 162nd or 164th. An agreement between property owners was intended to improve circulation along 162nd and 164<sup>th</sup> but the agreement has been abandoned. It appears that the applicant proposes upgrading 164th to the turnaround and providing through access across its plat with its new east-west streets.
25. The applicant will be using Renton standards for street improvements including vertical curbs, an 8-foot planter strip and on-street parking. Staff has recommended that the applicant pay a Traffic Impact Fee (King County) or Mitigation Fee (Renton) of \$75.00 per net new trip which equates to \$35,169.75 (9.57 trips/home x 49 homes).

26. King County Code (as noted above, the applicant is vested to and bound by King County Code) requires one tree for every 40 feet of street frontage along all public streets. The applicant proposes complying with those requirements as well as providing visual barriers using 10-foot landscape easements parallel to 162<sup>nd</sup> and 164<sup>th</sup> Ave SE. The applicant proposes planting 193 replacement trees along the roads and yards. This barrier would also contain a "good neighbor fence" that is modulated along 164<sup>th</sup> Ave SE. The applicant also proposed an 8-foot landscape strip along the perimeter of the tiered lots in the middle of the site. The applicant proposes a meandering sidewalk along both boundary streets. Staff suggested smaller street trees be blended with the larger trees. Staff noted that the applicant's landscaping proposal exceeds the standards required by King County. The applicant proposes relocating some of the larger ornamentals and may be able to protect other large trees where possible. As part of the Staff's recommendations a fence and additional landscaping would be installed along the north property line.
27. Code requires 390 square feet of recreation space for each home in this plat or 19,110 square feet for the entire plat. The detention tract will contain approximately 38,400 square feet or double the required amount. As noted this area will be open to the general public.
28. The subject site is located within the Issaquah School District. Developments within that school district are required to pay an impact fee on a per lot basis. The fee is assessable at the time of building permit approval and is \$6,021.00 per lot.
29. The development will increase traffic approximately 10 trips per unit or approximately 490 trips for the 49 single family homes. Approximately ten percent of the trips, or approximately 49 additional peak hour trips will be generated in the morning and evening. A recent traffic analysis shows traffic in the area has decreased and that the Levels of Service (LOS) for five critical intersections have improved and accidents numbers decreased. Some of the decrease might be due to the current economy but some may be a general reduction.
30. The TDR will enable eleven (11) additional dwellings. The 11 homes would generate approximately 105 additional trips per day or approximately 10 additional trips during the rush or peak hours. The additional trips generated by the TDR should not unduly affect the traffic in the area given the decrease in background traffic counts.
31. Stormwater will be channeled to the natural low spot, the southwest corner of the site where it will be retained in an enhanced detention pond and open space tract, Tract A. An analysis shows that there are downstream problems and the City imposed restrictions and containment based on the 2005 King County Surface Water Design Manual for flow and quality. The applicant will be required to comply with that manual's landscaping requirements.
32. Sewer service will be provided in 162nd Avenue and/or 164th whichever is more appropriate.
33. Water District #90 provides water service to this area. The water service will have to meet City of Renton standards for flow and fire protection. Appropriate permits from both agencies will be required.
34. There are some neighbors who are opposed to increasing the density of the subject site. The reasons expressed where that the smaller lots proposed are not compatible with the community, the increased

housing generates a larger population and additional vehicle trips and the increased density makes it less likely to preserve natural features and/or trees. There was also concern about some of the selected landscaping materials.

## **CONCLUSIONS:**

1. The proposed plat with its increased density possible with an appropriately executed TDR appears to serve the public use and interest. This is not to say that any increase in density in an area slated for lower density single family uses is appropriate even when the result is protected farm land or critical areas. While this office is not entirely convinced it is appropriate to shift density to an area zoned for lower density detached single family housing, the result in this case does not cause an egregious density increase and has been well-integrated into the lower density community by embedding the smaller lots in a surrounding envelope of larger conforming lots. In addition to the layout and alignment of the proposed lots, the applicant has increased the perimeter landscaping thereby buffering the surrounding uses from the increased density. The applicant will now also be increasing the landscaping and buffering along the north edge of the proposed plat better screening the northerly neighbors. The applicant will also be providing open space in its enhanced treatment of the stormwater detention system and this public space will be available to the general public as well as residents of the plat.
2. The development of the plat with or without the increased density will obviously change the complexion of the area. There will be more comings and goings and more people. Wooded open space will be converted to housing and manicured landscaping. These changes were anticipated by both the Comprehensive Plans and the Zoning both under King County and the City. Adjoining or nearby property has already been approved for increased development. While the density increase of the proposal will generate additional traffic, the 11 new homes will only nominally increase traffic during peak hours, the most pressing time for traffic. The 11 homes will add approximately 10 additional trips to area roads and those trips will spread out in various directions from the project. In addition, the applicant will be improving area roads and connecting roads that were substandard. The applicant will be improving access to Liberty High School's facilities and providing a second method of ingress and egress.
3. Clearly, the increased density may only be permitted if the appropriate agreements or contracts are executed and the preservation tradeoff comes to fruition. Staff recommended that the plat be subject to such final execution. Clearly, the proposed plat can only go forward as proposed. If the TDR is not finalized, this plat would have to fail since no one has had an opportunity to review a layout with eleven fewer lots. The entire plat would have to be redesigned.
4. The development of the proposed plat will increase the tax base of the City. The applicant will be paying some mitigation or impact fees but the increased taxes will also offset the impacts of this development on the City and its services.
5. The enhanced design of this plat is creative. It envelops smaller lots inside a wrapper of larger lots that appear to be compatible with the larger lots in surrounding plats. The applicant has increased the perimeter landscaping and enhanced landscaping and proposed larger yards to provide a more spacious presentation. The detention tract will serve a dual purpose by providing for stormwater control while also providing open space for both residents and the community. Clearly, there is no way that

introduced landscaping supplemented as it is, will replace the natural environment now found on the subject site. One aspect of developing property that cannot be avoided is that homes and driveways and access roads require the removal of existing vegetation and in some cases the reconfiguring of the natural contours of property. Again, such consequences were indirectly forecasted by the goals and objectives found in Comprehensive Plans and Zoning Code that allow housing and encourage housing and density in growing urban and suburban areas. This plat appears to provide a reasonable compromise.

6. Staff had suggested changes to some of the proposed yards. Since there is no limitation on larger yards, the applicant is free to work within building envelopes that meet the minimum standards and may provide larger yards. The applicant may not provide smaller setbacks than code permits and any porches, overhangs, bays or eaves must meet code provisions.
7. Staff suggested smaller street trees be blended with the larger trees along the streets. This would provide more visual depth and variety to the wider parking strips and should be accomplished.
8. The applicant should attempt to preserve some of the larger specimen trees where possible. All introduced landscaping should comply with standards for noxious weeds.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The City Council should approve the 49-lot plat subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall perform all steps and complete all documentation necessary, as required by King County Code section 21A.37, and the City of Renton, in order to process the Transfer of Development Right's properly for this subject plat only. The certificate or other valid legal document(s) must show the applicant or successor as the lawful owner of the development rights. If the agreement is not appropriately executed and finalized the plat shall be null and void and a new application meeting code and density requirement would be necessary.
2. The applicant shall obtain a demolition permit and all required inspections be completed for the removal of the existing residence prior to the recording of the plat.
3. Supplemental materials including a revised plat plan, a letter outlining all recommended setbacks and a draft of the CC & R's for the Homeowners' Association, with an inclusion of the setback requirements of the plat; shall be submitted to and approved by the Current Planning Project Manager prior to the recording of the plat.
4. The applicant shall replace the small street trees along the perimeter of the interior lots with a larger variety of street tree. The applicant shall use smaller street trees, in addition to the larger single tree, along the perimeter of the exterior lots.
5. The applicant shall be required to provide a detailed tree retention plan with the engineering review application. The tree retention plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Current

Planning Project Manager prior to engineering permit approval. The applicant shall attempt to preserve some of the larger specimen trees where possible. All introduced landscaping shall comply with standards for noxious weeds.

6. The applicant and Homeowners Association shall allow for public use of the walking path (providing a pedestrian connection from 162<sup>nd</sup> Ave SE and 164<sup>th</sup> Ave SE) and other recreation features within the storm pond (Tract A). Language to this effect shall be placed on the face of the plat and included in the Codes, Covenants & Restrictions (CC&R's).
7. Access for Lots 31-49 shall be limited to the proposed alley only. There shall be no direct access to either 162nd Avenue or 164th Avenue from any lot in the plat.
8. The applicant shall pay a Transportation Mitigation Fee based on \$75.00 per net new average daily trip attributed to the project. 49 lots are expected to generate approximately 9.57 new average weekday trips per each lot. The fee for the proposed plat is estimated at \$35,169.75 (\$75.00 x 9.57 trips x 49 lots = \$35,169.75) and is payable to the City prior to the recording of the final plat.
9. The applicant shall establish a homeowners' association for the development, which would be responsible for any common improvements and/or tracts within the plat prior to final plat approval.
10. A note shall be placed on the face of the plat stating that the Homeowners' Association will maintain all landscaping and amenities within the proposed storm pond from the fence outwards and the City will maintain the storm pond from the fence inward.
11. The applicant shall create a turnaround at the north terminus of 164th Avenue. The terminus may be located on the adjacent school district property or be located on Proposed Lots 10 and 11 or portions thereof and those two lots may be combined if necessary to create an appropriate turnaround and setbacks for a home on the lot or lots.
12. The applicant shall be required to erect a 6-foot high wood-fence along the northern property line for the length of the property. The fence shall be constructed prior to the Final Plat recording.
13. The applicant shall be required to plant conifer trees along the northern property line at appropriate spacing based on the vegetation proposed. All trees shall have a minimum height of 8-10 feet. The trees shall be depicted on the detailed landscape plan required to be submitted to and approved by the Current Planning Project

Manager prior to Final Plan approval.

ORDERED THIS 1<sup>st</sup> day of March 2010.

---

FRED J. KAUFMAN  
HEARING EXAMINER

TRANSMITTED THIS 1<sup>st</sup> day of March 2010 to the following:

Mayor Denis Law	Dave Pargas, Fire
Jay Covington, Chief Administrative Officer	Larry Meckling, Building Official
Julia Medzegian, Council Liaison	Planning Commission
Gregg Zimmerman, PBPW Administrator	Transportation Division
Alex Pietsch, Economic Development	Utilities Division
Jennifer Henning, Development Services	Neil Watts, Development Services
Stacy Tucker, Development Services	Janet Conklin, Development Services
Marty Wine, Assistant CAO	Renton Reporter

Pursuant to Title IV, Chapter 8, Section 100G of the City's Code, **request for reconsideration must be filed in writing on or before 5:00 p.m., March 15, 2010.** Any aggrieved person feeling that the decision of the Examiner is ambiguous or based on erroneous procedure, errors of law or fact, error in judgment, or the discovery of new evidence which could not be reasonably available at the prior hearing may make a written request for a review by the Examiner within fourteen (14) days from the date of the Examiner's decision. This request shall set forth the specific ambiguities or errors discovered by such appellant, and the Examiner may, after review of the record, take further action as he deems proper.

An appeal to the City Council is governed by Title IV, Chapter 8, Section 110, which requires that such appeal be filed with the City Clerk, accompanying a filing fee of \$250.00 and meeting other specified requirements. Copies of this ordinance are available for inspection or purchase in the Finance Department, first floor of City Hall. **An appeal must be filed in writing on or before 5:00 p.m., March 15, 2010.**

**If the Examiner's Recommendation or Decision contains the requirement for Restrictive Covenants, the executed Covenants will be required prior to approval by City Council or final processing of the file. You may contact this office for information on formatting covenants.**

The Appearance of Fairness Doctrine provides that no ex parte (private one-on-one) communications may occur concerning pending land use decisions. This means that parties to a land use decision may not communicate in private with any decision-maker concerning the proposal. Decision-makers in the land use process include both the Hearing Examiner and members of the City Council.

All communications concerning the proposal must be made in public. This public communication permits all interested parties to know the contents of the communication and would allow them to openly rebut the evidence. Any violation of this doctrine would result in the invalidation of the request by the Court.

The Doctrine applies not only to the initial public hearing but to all Requests for Reconsideration as well as Appeals to the City Council.